

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examination and allowance of pending claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-17 are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 8, 12, and 15 have been amended. Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled.

Applicants note that Claims 4, 13 and 18-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected species, this election being made in the reply filed on May 27, 2005.

The Examiner rejected Applicants' Claims 1, 5-10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gazca-Ortiz et al, US 6,196,902B1 (hereinafter Gazca-Ortiz).

Gazca-Ortiz neither describes nor suggests ... an encapsulation device for supporting two surfaces of the material ... a processing device for processing the edge adjacent to the supported two surfaces of the material that is located on a first side of said encapsulation device ... said encapsulation device substantially prevents particles and other contaminants generated when said processing device processes the edge of the material from reaching the two surfaces of the material located on a second side of said encapsulation device, *wherein said encapsulation device includes a support plate ...a pair of porous plates supported by said support plate and pressurized by air received from said support plate which flows through the porous plates and supports the two surfaces of the material within a gap between the porous plates, wherein the pressurized air emitted from the porous plates substantially prevents particles and other contaminants generated when said processing device processes the edge of the material from reaching the two surfaces of the material located on the second side of said encapsulation device...* as recited in Applicants' newly amended base Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicants have amended Claim 1. The Examiner refers to Gazca-Ortiz's figures 1 and 3 and their descriptions. Applicants contend that Gazca-Ortiz discloses an apparatus for finishing the edge of a glass sheet but does not disclose an encapsulation device that includes porous plates using air as recited above in Applicants' newly amended Claim 1. Gazca-Ortiz discloses that water supports and cools the workpiece with a vacuum. However, nowhere in Gazca-Ortiz is there a description or suggestion that the fluid be air, nor is it motivated or shown to work with air in lieu of water. Examiner does not point anywhere in Gazca-Ortiz showing the motivation or capacity of the Gazca-Ortiz to work with air. Applicants contend that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to simply change the fluid to air in lieu of water nor would it have worked in the Gazca-Ortiz device.

Accordingly, Applicants' newly amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the cited art. Applicants submit that newly amended Claim 1 is allowable and this rejection should be removed.

For reasons discussed in conjunction with base Claim 1, dependent Claims 5-7 are also patentably distinct over Gazca-Ortiz under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Additionally, similarly amended base Claim 8, and dependent Claims 9, 10, and 14 are also patentably distinct over Gazca-Ortiz under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Examiner rejected Applicants' Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by McMaster et al, US Patent No. 3,332,759, hereinafter McMaster.

McMaster neither describes nor suggests ... an apparatus for processing *an edge* of a glass sheet ... comprising ... a processing device *for processing only edges of a glass sheet* ... and an encapsulation device including a support plate ... a pair of porous plates supported by said support plate and pressurized by air received from said support plate which flows through the porous plates and supports two surfaces of the glass sheet within a gap between the porous plates, wherein the pressurized air emitted from the porous plates substantially *prevents particles and other contaminants* generated when said processing device processes the edge of the glass sheet on a first side of said

porous plates from reaching the two surfaces of the glass sheet located on a second side of said porous plates ... as recited in Applicants' base Claim 15 (emphasis added).

The Examiner notes that in treating the glass as it moves through the encapsulation device of figure 10, all surfaces are being processed by the furnace and the blast head, including the edge surfaces of the glass panel. Further, plates 69 and 70, having openings for producing air flow, are considered porous.

Applicants contend that the McMaster device, shown in Figure 10, covers only the entire sheet of glass and as such teaches away from the notion of Applicants' invention which relates to an apparatus for processing *an edge* of a glass sheet. Nowhere does McMaster disclose or suggest to "process only edges of a glass sheet" as recited in Applicants' Claim 15. Nowhere does McMaster disclose or suggest preventing particles and other contaminants generated from processing the edge of a glass sheet as recited in Claim 15 likely because McMaster discloses heat forming and not grinding or polishing, etc. of glass sheets where such particles are formed. Applicants submit that these features distinguish Claim 15 over the McMaster reference.

Accordingly, Applicants' Claim 15 is allowable and the rejection should be removed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Gazca-Ortiz et al, US006196902B1 in view of McMaster et al, 3,332,759. Applicants have cancelled Claims 2 and 11 and included the limitations found in these claims in base Claims 1 and 8. Applicants contend that newly amended Claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct over Gazca-Ortiz in view of McMaster under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) since Gazca-Ortiz discloses providing water to support and cool the workpiece, with a vacuum in the shroud opposite the working area but does not disclose or suggest, as discussed above, that the fluid be air. While McMaster discloses air, it is not utilized with processing edges of glass sheets.

As such Applicants maintain that Claim 1 and 8 contain patentable subject matter distinguishable over the cited art. Such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Applicants note that the Examiner stated that Claims 3, 12, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants note the prior art made of record but not relied upon, as not being pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

Applicants respectfully request that the pending Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-17 be rendered allowable and the rejection be removed.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely **Notice of Allowance** be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Joanne N. Pappas at 978-635-2289

Respectfully submitted,



Joanne N. Pappas
Attorney for Assignee
Registration Number: 40,117
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
Phone: 978-635-2289

DATE: November 4, 2005